

**REMARKS**

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In rejecting Claims 1-20, the Office Action asserts the claim language raises a question as to whether the claim is directed to an environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 so that each now recites “transmitting the first enterprise information that is in the target form to the target computerized system for processing therein.” Applicants assert that this limitation is a concrete, useful, and/or tangible result which forms a basis of patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Given that Claims 1 and 12 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §101 it follows that the remaining claims are likewise in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §101.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hellman, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163597 A1 (“Hellman”). Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to include limitations not taught or fairly suggested in the cited sections of Hellman, either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent Claims 1 and 12. For example, independent Claims 1 and 12 now recite “converting the first enterprise information in the second intermediate form into first enterprise information that is in a second target form that corresponds to a second target computerized system.” This limitation should be

compared with respect to Claim 1 and 12's limitation of converting the first enterprise information and the second intermediate form into first enterprise information that is in a target form that corresponds to a target computerized system. Applicants assert that support for this newly added limitation can be found within the Specification in paragraph 67 thereof. Applicants assert the sited sections of Hellman do not teach or fairly suggest the foregoing, either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent Claims 1 and 12. Given that independent Claims 1 and 12 have been shown to be patentably distinguishable over Hellman, it follows that the remaining claims are likewise patentably distinguishable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5093.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,321  
Telephone: (512) 439-5093  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099